UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,494	07/11/2003	James Owen	ORACL-01370US0	5406
⁸⁰⁵⁴⁸ Fliesler Meyer l	7590 11/20/200 LLP	EXAMINER		
650 California S		KIM, PAUL		
14th Floor San Francisco, CA 94108			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2169		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/618,494	OWEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
PAUL KIM		

		1710ETUIVI	2100
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE RE	PLY FILED <u>04 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.
ap ap for	e reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on plication, applicant must timely file one of the following plication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Criods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	= -	
b) 🔼	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
have beer under 37 set forth in may redu	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(s of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date in filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of excEFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later the early earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
	e Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filir	g the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extentice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
(a)	ne proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, l They raise new issues that would require further col They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c)	They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a	ter form for appeal by materially red	
(u)	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		soled daims.
4. 🔲 Tr	e amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
	oplicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		,
6. N	ewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all n-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate,	
ho Th Cla Cla Cla	r purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) with the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: sim(s) allowed: sim(s) objected to: sim(s) rejected: sim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an explanation of
	/IT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
be	e affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu cause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and s not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		
en	e affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing ered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o owing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
	ne affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio ST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
11. 🔯 T	ne request for reconsideration has been considered bu ee Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
	ote the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (ther:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
	Mahmoudi/ isory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

As per independent claim 1, Applicant asserts the argument that "Park does not disclose any virutal content repositories, nor does Park disclose integrating a plurality of repositories into virtual content repositories." See Amendment, page 15. The Examiner respectfully disagrees in that Park discloses a system for providing "an integrated search service for inegrating data from various data sources and allowing for search based on search conditions." See Park, [0035]. While Applicant asserts the argument that "Park does not disclose integrating a plurality of content repositories into virtual content repositories such that the plurality of content repositories appear and behave as a single repository," it is noted that in view of aforementioned prior art disclose, Park would indeed disclose a system wherein content from various services existing on the web may be represented as a virtual single repository.

Secondly, Applicant asserts the argument that Beach fails to disclose "second functions for incorporating combined content of the plurality of content repositories into a hierarchical namespace." See Amendment, page 16. The Examiner respectfully disagrees in that Beach discloses an invention wherein an indexer adds an object name within the hiearchcial namespace as represented by the graph of directories. See Beach, col. 8, lines 38-57. While Applicant asserts the argument that "Beach does not disclose second functions for incorporating combined content of the plurality of content repositories into a hiearchical namespace," it is noted that combination of both Park and Beach would disclose a system wherein a hierarchical namespace may be created for integrated content.

Accordingly, for the aforementioned reasons above, the rejections of claims 1, 18, 34, and 54 are maintained under 35 U.S.C. 103.